Date: Thu, 25 Mar 93 11:40:30 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #75
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 25 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 75

Today's Topics:
ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
The next attack on hams?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 1993 17:32:38 GMT
From: noc.near.net!nic.umass.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.unomaha.edu!cwis!
pschleck@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bulletin@n8emr.cmhnet.org (Automatic packet bulletin poster) writes:

>==
>| Automatic relayed from packet radio via |
>| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-895-2553 |
>==

>ZCZC AG73
>QST DE W1AW
>ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
>FROM ARRL HEADQUARTERS NEWINGTON CT
>MARCH 23, 1993
>RELAYED BY KB8NW/OBS & BARF-80 BBS
>TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS

>
>SB QST ARL ARLB032
>ARLB032 ARLB030 REVISION/UPDATE
>
>MESSAGE CONTENT PROPOSAL
>
>THE FCC HAS PROPOSED TO CHANGE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CONTENT OF
>AMATEUR MESSAGES RELAYED BY HIGH-SPEED NETWORKS.
>
>ON MARCH 22, 1993, THE COMMISSION ANNOUNCED ACTION IN DOCKET 93-85,
>IN NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING 93-154, PROPOSING TO ESTABLISH ''A
>COMPLIANCE POLICY FOR AMATEUR STATIONS PARTICIPATING IN AUTOMATIC
>MESSAGE FORWARDING SYSTEMS, TO HOLD THE LICENSEE OF THE STATION
>ORIGINATING A MESSAGE AND THE LICENSEE OF THE FIRST FORWARDING
>STATION PRIMARILY ACCOUNTABLE FOR VIOLATIVE COMMUNICATIONS.
>

Hmmm, this sounds very much like a spin-off from FCC Docket 92-136, which was to re-evaluate the so-called "No Business" rule of Part 97. I brought up the subject of packet networks and automatic forwarding in my reply comments (and I know others, including Phil Karn, did too). I offered the simpler test of responsibility that would result from an overhauled "No Business" rule as one of the many excellent reasons for modifying the rules back to their pre-1972, pre-Eye-Back-Docket state.

Is the FCC going to pass the above special rule, then turn around and say that most signficant motivation for 92-136 has now been rendered moot? While I would agree with the proposal offered above, it unnecessarily complicates Part 97 (and makes it technology-specific) when all that is needed is a simpler "No Business" rule that holds the operator responsible for not benefitting personally from the communications.

Anyone else have another spin on things?

73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 1993 15:15:46 GMT
From: yuma!gw214790@purdue.edu
Subject: The next attack on hams?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1271@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:
>

><<< Humor alert--the following is not meant seriously. >>>

>Of course, since RF exposure reduces as you move away from the source
>of radiation, maybe the correct approach is to argue that all ham
>antennas should be mounted atop towers of at least 120-foot height,
>and all ordinances or contracts/covenants that disallow such towers
>should be declared null and void. Further, since the cost of these
>towers is a hardship, government grants (hey, why not feed at the
>trough?) should be provided to any amateur wanting to put up a 120'
>tower.
>Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
>American Radio Relay League | Justice is being allowed to do whatever
>225 Main St. | I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
>Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Maybe we should take it seriously, this sounds like a good idea.

I live under a 40 foot, county-wide restriction.

Galen Watts,KF0YJ

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 1993 18:18:32 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!unix.ka9q.ampr.org!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar20.154128.17484@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Mar22.010104.27200@qualcomm.com>, <1993Mar22.140452.26419@ke4zv.uucp>
Reply-To : karn@servo.qualcomm.com
Subject : Re: No Radios on Airlines

In article <1993Mar22.140452.26419@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman)
writes:
|> I'm not sure it was the FAA that expanded the Loran C net. I think
|> it was still the Coast Guard. It's for inland navigation on lakes
|> and rivers and such.

Actually, I think it was some sort of joint project between the FAA
and the Coast Guard. They created two new chains, adding several new
stations and dual rating several existing ones.

 I have a Loran C unit mounted in my truck.
|> While it usually is accurate to about 600 feet, and *repeatable to
|> much better than that, there are times when it's in error by miles.
|> That's because of terrain problems, over water or in the air it should
|> do better. However, a friend who carries a portable in his light plane
|> reports similar errors, especially when flying near Stone Mountain.

Loran on the ground has problems because of bridges, power lines and the like. We (Qualcomm) abandoned it in our Omnitracs system several years ago in favor of "piggybacking" navigation information on the satellite communication signal. The main problem was the mid-continent gap which hadn't been filled yet, but it also let us cut the cost of the mobile unit by getting rid of the Loran receiver.

Loran on the ground *does* work much better than VOR on the ground. :-)

Loran on airplanes has fewer problems than on the ground, but I can certainly believe they do exist. That's why you never want to rely on just one radionavigation system, but have several to back each other up.

|> The signals are the reverse of spread spectrum, everything is on the
|> same frequency, and the stations are slotted by time. You have to get
|> a receive lock on at least three of the stations to get a position fix.
|> The receivers have adaptive filters that optimize reception of the
|> slotted signals. It usually takes several minutes for the receiver to
|> acquire lock and start reporting accurate position information.

Correct except for the first statement. Loran does indeed have many of the characteristics of spread spectrum. It uses a relatively wide band (20 Khz is a *lot* at 100 Khz!), and all the transmitters use the same frequency at the same time with minimal interference. Only signals that are correlated with the timing of a given chain's stations can really interfere with them; noncorrelated interference can be averaged out over time. This is just like spread spectrum, but you spread with narrow RF pulses instead of PN chips. Indeed, you can sometimes model a PN spread spectrum system as though it actually sent narrow pulses one chip wide.

|> >On the other hand, the VOR and ILS signals are about as fragile as you
|> >can get. It's amazing they work as well as they do.
|>
|> VOR is rather simple and robust, and microwave ILS is good. The older
|> ILS systems operating at high HF are bad, and the MF airway markers are
|> nearly useless most of the time. Since those systems date from the 1920s,
|> I'm not surprised.

Well, VOR is an analog system, so small amounts of RFI can deflect meters without giving any warning that the system is inaccurate. Digital systems tend to be more robust to small amounts of interference. Not that they're immune, of course, but when they do fail, they tend to go suddenly and completely. An operator seeing this is less likely to assume it's working correctly. This is a valuable feature.

Phil

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #75
****